

ARI Working Papers

Fort Benjamin Harrison Field Unit

1982

These working papers are published in order to archive material that was not included in other ARI publications. The material contained herein may not meet ARI's usual scientific or professional standards for publication.

July 2001

United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

20010827 057

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) July 2001		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (from. . . to) 1982	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE ARI Working Papers: Fort Benjamin Harrison Field Unit, 1982				5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER	
				5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Sterling, B.S. & Williams, L.J.				5c. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5d. TASK NUMBER	
				5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences ATTN: TAPC-ARI-PO 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600				10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI	
				11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER WP Harrison	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ARI working papers were originally unofficial documents intended for limited distribution to obtain comments. These working papers are being archived in order to preserve material that was not included in other ARI publications. The material contained herein may not meet ARI's usual scientific or professional standards for publication.					
14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words): One working paper dealing with cohesion in Army units.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Cohesion					
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	20. NUMBER OF PAGES 48	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Name and Telephone Number) David W. Witter (703) 617-0324
16. REPORT Unclassified	17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified			

Fort Benjamin Harrison Field Unit Working Paper

Sterling, B.S. & Williams, L.J. (1982). A study of cohesion in Army units at four unit levels. WP FHA 82-01.

82-01

A Study of Cohesion in
Army Units at Four Unit
Levels

Bruce S. Sterling

Larry J. Williams

WORKING PAPER

ARI Field Unit-Fort Benjamin Harrison

June 1982



FOREWORD

The Fort Harrison Field Unit of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences is responsible for providing the Army with information and products to enhance personnel management and effectiveness at unit level. Unit cohesion is a key factor in determining personnel readiness. The present report explores various aspects of unit cohesion and its consequences at squad, platoon, company and battalion levels. This research is part of the overall ARI FY82 work program under Domain 1 (Manning and Maintaining the Force), Thrust 5 (Personnel System Management) Work Unit 01 (Developing Personnel Doctrine for Unity).

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the dimensions of cohesion, intensity of cohesion and relation of cohesion to soldiers' attitudes and behaviors at squad, platoon, company and battalion levels. Results suggested that cohesion was unidimensional, especially at squad and platoon levels. At company level there was a tendency for the three dimensional model to fit the data while at battalion level neither model provided an exceptional fit. Cohesion was more intense below than above platoon level. Also cohesion was equally (and moderately positively) related to soldiers' career intentions, satisfaction with the Army, and morale at all four levels.

A STUDY OF COHESION IN ARMY UNITS AT FOUR UNIT LEVELS

BRIEF

Requirement:

Research concerning the dimensions of cohesion, intensity of cohesion in organizations (units) of different sizes and the relationship of cohesion to member attitudes and behaviors is mixed. The purpose of this research is to examine the dimensions of cohesion, intensity of cohesion and relationship between cohesion and soldiers' attitudes and behaviors at squad, platoon, company and battalion level.

Procedures:

Four hundred sixty-six enlisted members (97% E4 or under) from four different duty locations in USAREUR completed surveys containing items measuring potentially three separate dimensions of cohesion (peer cohesion, hierarchical cohesion and commitment) as well as items measuring career intentions, satisfaction with the Army, morale and sick call rate. Soldiers were randomly assigned to complete surveys concerning cohesion at the squad, platoon, company or battalion level.

Findings:

Results concerning the structure of cohesion suggested that cohesion was unidimensional, especially at squad and platoon levels. A three factor model (peer cohesion, hierarchical cohesion and commitment) tended to provide better fit to the data at company level while neither the one nor three factor model fit particularly well at battalion level. Cohesion at squad and platoon level

was greater than cohesion at company and battalion level. However cohesion was equally (moderately) related to soldiers' career intentions, satisfaction with the Army and morale at each of the four unit sizes. It was unrelated to sick call rate for all unit sizes.

Utilization of findings:

It appears that cohesion should be studied as a undimensional concept. Also, efforts should be made to maintain unit integrity at squad and platoon level, since cohesion tends to be most intense there.

A STUDY OF COHESION IN ARMY UNITS AT FOUR UNIT LEVELS

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
METHOD	
Subject	
Instruments	
Procedure	
Analyses	
RESULTS	
DISCUSSION	
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Confirmatory factory analysis of cohesion items at four levels
2.	Intensity of cohesion at four unit levels
3.	Relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes/behavior; squad level
4.	Relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes/behavior; platoon level
5.	Relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes/behavior; company level
6.	Relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes/behavior; battalion level

A STUDY OF COHESION IN ARMY UNITS AT FOUR UNIT LEVELS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to provide information on three basic questions about cohesion in Army units. The first question concerns the dimensions of cohesion. Cartwright (1968) in his classic review of the cohesion literature, as well as Lott and Lott (1965) in their review equating cohesion to interpersonal attraction, confirm that most researchers see cohesion as unidimensional. However, Etzioni (1975) hypothesized that there are two dimensions of cohesion: peer cohesion and hierarchical cohesion. The interpersonal bonds among peers are hypothesized to determine the amount of variation in group behavior. That is low peer cohesion is reflected by large variations in behavior among group members, while high peer cohesion results in uniform behavior among group members. Interpersonal relations between superiors and subordinates is said to determine the direction of behavior. That is, good hierarchical cohesion is hypothesized to result in generally positive group behavior (from the organization's viewpoint) while poor hierarchical cohesion is said to result in generally negative group behavior. Rigby, Savell, Holmes and Hunter (1981) saw cohesion as three dimensional. They agreed with Etzioni's two dimensions of peer and hierarchical cohesion, but add the dimension of commitment to the organization, directly tapping the direction of cohesion. Rigby et al. developed scales to measure each of these three concepts at platoon level in Army basic and advanced individual training (AIT) units. These scales had good internal validity and relatively low intercorrelations suggesting that they were different concepts (i.e., discriminant validity). Also, external validity of these dimensions is suggested since for all three dimensions of cohesion, units remaining together through basic and AIT was higher than

cohesion in units where the AIT group was comprised of soldiers from various basic training units. The present research will examine whether these three dimensions of cohesion exist at squad, platoon, company and battalion levels in active Army units located in the U.S. Army-Europe (USAREUR).

The second question this research addresses is whether cohesion varies with unit size. Porter and Lawler (1965) review numerous studies examining indicators which seem to be related to cohesion, such as morale, absenteeism and turnover. Results show that as group size increases, morale decreases while absenteeism and turnover increases. Seashore (1954) measured group cohesiveness directly and found it to decline with increasing group size. Indik (1965) however, argues that group size is not directly related to indicators of cohesion (such as absenteeism and turnover). He presents data suggesting that as group size increases, communication tends to decrease and specialization increases; and that these factors in turn result in lower cohesion or morale. Regardless, there is little research concerning the effects of group size on cohesion in a military context. Shils (1950) in discussing the role of the "primary group" in the lives of World War II soldiers gives most of his examples at squad, platoon and company level, but no attempt is made to differentiate the intensity of cohesion among units of different sizes. The present research will attempt to assess the level (i.e., intensity) of cohesion in different sized units from squad to battalion level in USAREUR units.

The third question addressed by this research is the relationship between cohesion and soldiers' career intentions, absenteeism (sick call rates), satisfaction with the Army and morale. Schachter (1951) and Libo (1953) found that intentions to remain group members were higher in more cohesive groups while

Scott (1965) found that more cohesive members actually remain group members longer. However, it does not necessarily follow that cohesion should be positively related to career intentions in the Army. For subjects in the above research intent to remain with the group and intent to remain with the organization were the same. This is not true with the Army since one could remain with the Army but still switch primary groups. Mann and Baumgartel (1952) and Indik (1965) found cohesiveness related negatively to absenteeism. Gouldner (1954), however, found that cohesion was related positively to absenteeism when group norms favored absenteeism. To the author's knowledge there is no research on the relationship between cohesion and sick call rates in the Army. Marquis, Guetzkow and Henns (1951) as well as Exline (1957) found cohesion to be positively related to satisfaction with group processes, which seems similar to job satisfaction. However, although no research has been performed on the subject, it seems likely that cohesion could be negatively associated with job satisfaction (or satisfaction with the Army) if the group norm was antiorganizational. In fact, studies by Schachter, Ellerton, McBride and Gregory (1951), Seashore (1954) and Patchen (1962) show that cohesion relates negatively to productivity when group norms are antiorganizational. Finally, there appears to be no research concerning the relationship between cohesion and morale, perhaps because these terms are difficult to operationally distinguish. That is a group which stated it worked well together (an indication of good cohesion) could also be said to have good morale. The present research will examine the relationship between cohesion and soldiers' career intentions, sick call rates, satisfaction with the Army and morale in different sized units.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 466 enlisted members, E5 or under, from four different duty locations in USAREUR. About 97% were E1 to E4s with no leadership responsibilities. Forty-nine percent were nonwhite and 28% were female.

Instruments

This research was conducted by adding an additional page to a survey already being conducted by ARI in USAREUR. While other items were contained in this survey, the two types of items relevant to this research were cohesion items and measures of soldiers' attitudes and behavior. There were six cohesion items contained on the additional page added to the survey. Two of them tapped each of three dimensions of cohesion hypothesized by Rigby et al.: peer cohesion, hierarchical cohesion and commitment (see Appendix, items 51 to 56).

Items already present in the survey measured soldiers' career intentions, sick call rate, satisfaction with the Army and individual morale (operationally, items 7B, 6A divided by 6C, 59 and 66 respectively). The group size variable was manipulated simply by having four versions of the added page with the questions identical except for the phrases "your squad," "platoon," "company" or "battalion."

Procedure

Soldiers were assembled in a classroom and completed the survey on duty time. Equal numbers of each of the four versions of the survey (referring to squad, platoon, company and battalion) were distributed to all groups.

Analyses

The hypothesis concerning the number of dimensions of cohesion at each of the four levels was tested using maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. While this is explained thoroughly elsewhere (e.g., Joreskog, 1981, pp. 21-43, Kenny, 1979, pp. 122-123), this technique is basically different from standard factor analysis in that it allows a significance level to be attached to a given factor model by means of a chi square goodness of fit test. That is, this type of analysis allows for the testing of the fit of a given factor model to the observed correlations. Thus, a proposed model cannot be rejected unless it deviates from the expected solution by an amount significantly greater than chance. Also, if more than one model cannot be rejected, this method permits a chi-square test between the two to assess if one provides a significantly better fit to the data than the other.

To test the hypothesis concerning the intensity of cohesion at the various unit levels, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed, contrasting the intensity of cohesion at each of the four unit levels.

The relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes and behavior was tested using Pearson correlations between the cohesion measure(s) and the various dependent measures.

Results

Results concerning the number of dimensions of cohesion at each of the four levels are reported in Table 1. These results showed that at conventional levels of significance ($P < .05$) neither the one nor three factor models could be rejected, nor were there any reliable differences between the fit of these two models at each of the four levels. However, closer inspection of the results suggested that at company level the one factor model approached rejection in favor of the three factor model ($P < .10$ in both cases) while at battalion level both the one and three factor models approached ($P < .10$) rejection.

Thus at squad and platoon levels neither the one nor three factor models could be rejected. However, since the three factor model did not provide a significantly better fit to the data than the one factor model, the law of parsimony dictated retention of the one factor (unidimensional) model of cohesion at these two levels.

At company level, the three factor model tended to provide a better fit while at battalion level neither the one nor three factor model fit particularly well.

However, since at traditional levels of significance the one factor model could not be rejected at any level and the three factor model was not a significantly better fit at any level, one cohesion scale was formed by summing the standard scores of the six cohesion items. This served as the measure of cohesion discussed below.

Table 1

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Cohesion Items at Four Levels

1 Factor Model			3 Factor Model			Difference		
χ^2	df	P	χ^2	df	P	χ^2	df	P <
			Squad Level					
6.50	9	.69	3.69	6	.72	2.81	3	.50
			Platoon Level					
13.50	9	.11	9.22	6	.17	4.71	3	.25
			Company Level					
16.41	9	.06	8.82	6	.19	7.59	3	.10
			Battalion Level					
15.52	9	.08	12.37	6	.06	3.15	3	.50

Results concerning the intensity of cohesion at the various unit levels are reported in Table 2. Data shows that intensity of cohesion varies significantly as a function of unit level $F(3,416) = 3.66, P < .05$. Contrasts between cell means suggest that intensity of cohesion at squad/platoon levels is about the same, but significantly higher than cohesion at company/battalion levels which are also about the same.

Results concerning the relationship between cohesion and soldier attitudes and behaviors are shown in Tables 3 through 6 for squad, platoon, company and battalion levels, respectively. Examination of these tables reveals that cohesion is, at all levels, moderately related to career intentions, satisfaction with the Army and morale, and unrelated to sick call rate.

Also career intentions, satisfaction with the Army and morale are all moderately interrelated at all levels. Only satisfaction with the Army correlates with sick call rates, and this occurs only at platoon and company levels.

Table 2

Intensity of Cohesion at Four Unit Levels

	<u>Cohesion</u>
Squad	.747 _a
Platoon	.430 _a
Company	-.624 _b
Battalion	-.514 _b

Notes: Higher scores denote higher cohesion

Scores with different subscripts
differ at $p < .06$

Table 3

Relationship Between Cohesion and Soldier Attitudes/Behavior: Squad Level

		Cohesion	Career Intentions	Satisfaction with the Army	Morale	Sick Call Rate
Cohesion	r =	-	.29	.33	.22	-.04
	n =		94	96	95	84
	p <		.05	.001	.05	N.S.
Career Intentions	r =		-	.38	.17	.05
	n =			104	103	91
	p <			.001	.10	N.S.
Satisfaction with the Army	r =			-	.40	.11
	n =				105	93
	p <				.001	N.S.
Morale	r =				-	.01
	n =					92
	p <					N.S.

Note: Career intention item reversed so that higher scores denote more positive career intent

Table 4

Relationship Between Cohesion and Soldier Attitudes/Behavior: Platoon Level

		Cohesion	Career Intentions	Satisfaction with the Army	Morale	Sick Call Rate
Cohesion	r =	-	.19	.27	.35	-.13
	n =		101	104	103	91
	p <		.10	.01	.001	N.S.
Career Intentions	r =		-	.48	.33	.07
	n =			109	109	96
	p <			.001	.001	N.S.
Satisfaction with the Army	r =			-	.41	-.18
	n =				111	99
	p <				.001	.10
Morale	r =				-	-.01
	n =					98
	p <					N.S.

Note: Career intention item reversed so that higher scores denote more positive career intent

Table 5

Relationship Between Cohesion and Soldier Attitudes/Behavior: Company Level

		Cohesion	Career Intentions	Satisfaction with the Army	Morale	Sick Call Rate
Cohesion	r =	-	.22	.18	.33	-.12
	n =		107	111	111	99
	p <		.05	.10	.001	N.S.
Career Intentions	r =		-	.28	.14	.04
	n =			117	117	106
	p <			.01	N.S.	N.S.
Satisfaction with the Army	r =			-	.33	-.21
	n =				121	109
	p <				.001	.05
Morale	r =				-	.18
	n =					109
	p <					N.S.

Note: Career intention item reversed so that higher scores denote more positive career intent

Table 6

Relationship Between Cohesion and Soldier Attitudes/Behavior: Battalion Level

		Cohesion	Career Intentions	Satisfaction with the Army	Morale	Sick Call Rate
Cohesion	r =	-	.23	.38	.35	.01
	n =		106	109	109	94
	p <		.05	.001	.001	N.S.
Career Intentions	r =	-		.38	.25	.03
	n =			115	115	99
	p <			.001	.01	N.S.
Satisfaction with the Army	r =			-	.36	-.02
	n =				118	102
	p <				.001	N.S.
Morale	r =				-	-.11
	n =					102
	p <					N.S.

Note: Career intention item reversed so that higher scores denote more positive career intent

Discussion

These results did not support the three factor model of cohesion over the one factor model, especially at squad and platoon levels. At company level, there was a tendency for the three factor model to provide a better fit, while at battalion level both one and three factor model approached rejection. These results do not necessarily contradict the work of Rigby et al. (1981), since this research, as theirs, failed to reject the three factor model of cohesion at platoon level. However, the present research went further and found that the three factor would fit the data no better than a one factor model; a hypothesis Rigby et al. did not address. Of course, with the limited number of items used (2) to define each factor this cannot be considered a definitive test.

This research also suggested that cohesion at squad and platoon levels is more intense than cohesion at company and battalion levels. This is in keeping with the literature reviewed above which suggests that cohesion is higher in smaller groups as well as the social psychological concept of cohesion as a small group (perhaps 40 people or less) phenomenon. In the author's personal experience, daily unit personnel policies such as details and temporary assignments tend to limit the ability of squads and platoons to train together. Since this research suggests that these levels are where the strongest cohesion exists, efforts should be made to maintain unit integrity across as many activities as possible at these levels.

Finally, these results show that while the intensity of cohesion may differ above and below platoon level, the relationship between cohesion and soldiers' career intentions, satisfaction with the Army and morale remains

constant across levels. Specifically there is a moderate positive relationship between unit cohesion and soldiers' attitudes at squad through battalion levels. This suggests that cohesion is an equally important determinant of positive military related attitudes at all unit levels up to battalion.

References

- Berkowitz, L. Group standard, cohesiveness and productivity. Human Relations, 1959, 7, 509-519.
- Cartwright, D. The nature of group cohesiveness. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.) Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Etzioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Exline, R. V. Group climate as a factor in the relevance and accuracy of a social perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 382-388.
- Gouldner, A. W. Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- Indik, B. P. Organization size and member participation: Some empirical tests of alternative explanations. Human Relations, 1965, 18, 339-350.
- Joreskog, K. G. A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis with addendum. In K. G. Joreskog & D. Sorbom (Eds.) Advances in factor analysis and structural equation models. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1981.
- Kenny, D. A. Correlation and causality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979.
- Libo, L. Measuring group cohesiveness. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press (Institute for Social Research) Research Center for Group Dynamics, 1953.
- Lott, A. J. & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-300.
- Mann, F. & Baumgartel, H. Absences and employee attitudes in an electric power company. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1952.
- Marquis, D. G., Guetzkow, A., & Henns, R. W. A social psychological study of the decision-making conference. In H. Guetzhaw (Ed.) Groups, leadership and men. Pittsburg: Carnegie Press, 1951.
- Patchen, M. Supervisory methods and group performance norms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, 276-290.
- Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E. Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and job behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 23-51.
- Rigby, C. K., Savell, J. M., Holmes, D. S., & Hunter, F. A preliminary assessment of military cohesiveness in FORSCOM train and retain platoons. (Draft Technical Report) Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, March 1981.

- Seashore, S. E. Group cohesiveness in the industrial work group. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1954.
- Schachter, S. Deviation, rejection, and communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 190-207.
- Schachter, S., Ellerton, N., McBride, D., & Gregory, D. An experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity. Human Relations, 1951, 4, 229-238.
- Scott, W. A. Values and organizations, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Shils, E. A. Primary groups in the American Army. In R. F. Merton & P. F. Lazarsfeld (Eds.) Studies in the scope and method of the American soldier. New York: Free Press, 1950.

Appendix

Survey Instrument

CONUS-E

OPINION SURVEY

The US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is conducting a survey of the first term enlisted soldier. We are asking first term enlisted soldiers who are in the Army and who are being discharged from the Army to answer this survey.

Please be honest about your answers.

Please do not take too much time on any of the questions; your first response is usually the best. Please answer each and every question. Please read each question thoroughly and fill in the space under your answer on the answer sheet.

For example:

Are you in the Army?

1. Yes
2. No

Answer Sheet:

A	B	C	D	E
A	B	C	D	E
A	B	C	D	E
A	B	C	D	E
A	B	C	D	E

NOT TO BE SHOWN TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. NOT TO BE REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM WITHOUT THE SPECIFIC PERMISSION OF THE TECHNICAL DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

TITLE OF FORM: Opinion Survey

PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE: AR 70-1

AUTHORITY: 10 USC 4503

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(s):

The data collected with the attached form are to be used for research purposes only.

ROUTINE USES:

This is an experimental personnel data collection form developed by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences pursuant to its research mission as prescribed in AR 70-1. When identifiers (name or Social Security Number) are requested they are to be used for administrative and statistical control purposes only. Full confidentiality of the responses will be maintained in the processing of these data.

MANDATORY OR VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE AND EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION:

Your participation in this survey is strictly voluntary. Individuals are encouraged to provide complete and accurate information in the interests of the research, but there will be no penalty to soldiers for not providing all or any part of the information.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. This survey has two parts: an Answer Sheet and a Question Booklet. The section that you are now reading is the Question Booklet. Check to see that you have an Answer Sheet.
2. Read each question carefully.
3. After you have decided on your answer, mark it on your separate Answer Sheet.
4. Be sure to mark only one answer for each question. Be sure to answer ALL questions.
5. Be sure to follow the answer sheet carefully. Match the numbers on the answer sheet with the number of each question.
6. Please use a pencil in completing this form.
7. Please do NOT make any marks on the Question Booklet.
8. Again, be sure to answer every question.

9908

1. Write the name of your INSTALLATION/POST in #1. Name.
DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME.
2. Write today's date in #2. Date.
3. Leave #3 PT Number BLANK. Do not fill it in.
4. Write your Social Security Number in the boxes and fill in the space under the matching number. For example, the Social Security Number 123-45-6789 is filled in.
5. Continue on the next page with 5A to 11.

5A. How old are you?

- 0. 17
- 1. 18
- 2. 19
- 3. 20
- 4. 21
- 5. 22
- 6. 23
- 7. 24
- 8. 25
- 9. 26+

5B. Education:

- 0. Less than high school diploma
- 1. GED or high school equivalency
- 2. High school diploma
- 3. Some vocational (technical) school
- 4. Vocational (technical) school degree
- 5. Some college
- 6. Bachelor's Degree
- 7. Post graduate work or degree

5C. What is your current rank/grade?

- 0. Private (E1)
- 1. Private (E2)
- 2. Private First Class (E3)
- 3. Specialist 4 (E4)
- 4. Corporal (E4)
- 5. Specialist 5 (E5)
- 6. Sergeant (E5)
- 7. Specialist 6 (E6)
- 8. Staff Sergeant (E6)

5D. Race:

- 0. Black
- 1. White
- 2. Hispanic
- 3. Oriental
- 4. Native American
- 5. Other

6A. From the time you arrived at this installation, how many days have you been sick and could not work?

- 0. None
- 1. One - two
- 2. Three - Four
- 3. Five - Six
- 4. Seven - eight
- 5. Nine - ten
- 6. Eleven - twelve
- 7. Thirteen - Fourteen
- 8. Fifteen or more

6B. How long have you been in the Army?

- 0. 1-3 mo.
- 1. 4-6 mo.
- 2. 7-9 mo.
- 3. 10-12 mo.
- 4. 13-15 mo.
- 5. 16-18 mo.
- 6. 19-21 mo.
- 7. 22-24 mo.
- 8. over 24 mo.

6C. How long have you been at this installation?

- 0. 1-3 mo.
- 1. 4-6 mo.
- 2. 7-9 mo.
- 3. 10-12 mo.
- 4. 13-15 mo.
- 5. 16-18 mo.
- 6. 19-21 mo.
- 7. 22-24 mo.
- 8. over 24 mo.

6D. Marital Status: Which one of the following best describes your marital status?

- 0. Single
- 1. Married to a civilian
- 2. Married to another military member
- 3. Legally separated
- 4. Divorced
- 5. Widowed

7A. Before joining the Army were you: (choose one that best described you)

1. Unemployed
2. Employed - unhappily
3. In high school
4. In a technical school or college
5. Employed - happily
6. In a reserve unit

7B. Which of the following best describes your career intentions at the present time?

1. I will stay in the Army until retirement.
2. I will reenlist upon completion of my present obligation but am undecided about staying until retirement.
3. I am undecided whether I will reenlist.
4. I will probably leave the Army upon completion of my present obligation.
5. I will definitely leave the Army upon completion of my present obligation.
6. I will probably leave the Army before completion of my present obligation.
7. I will definitely leave the Army before completion of my present obligation.

8. What is your primary MOS?(for example, 11B, 13B, 36C, etc.) (write in on your answer sheet)

9. What is your secondary MOS? (write in on your answer sheet)

10. What is your duty MOS? (write in on your answer sheet)

11. If you were to reenlist today, what MOS would you want? (write in on your answer sheet)

1. NAME		CLASS		INITIAL	
2. DATE		3. P.T. NUMBER			
IDENTIFICATION					
1. A	B	C	D	E	F
2. A	B	C	D	E	F
3. A	B	C	D	E	F
4. A	B	C	D	E	F
5. A	B	C	D	E	F
6. A	B	C	D	E	F
7. A	B	C	D	E	F
8. A	B	C	D	E	F
9. A	B	C	D	E	F
10. A	B	C	D	E	F
11. A	B	C	D	E	F
12. A	B	C	D	E	F
TEST					
1. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
2. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
3. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
4. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
5. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
6. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
7. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
8. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
9. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
10. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
11. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	
12. A	B	C	D	LOCATION	

↓ Leave P1 to P10 Blank.

Turn to the next page of this survey and read Question 1. Fill in your answer on this answer sheet on Answer 1. Continue until you have finished the survey.

1. What is your sex?

- A. Male
- B. Female

2. Did you grow up in a military family?

- A. Yes
- B. No

3. Housing:

- A. On post - barracks
- B. On post - family housing
- C. On post - other
- D. Off post - government furnished housing
- E. Off post - civilian housing

4. What kind of company/battery/troop/detachment are you in?

- A. Field Artillery, Air Defense Artillery, Armor, Armor Cavalry, Infantry
- B. Chemical, Engineer, Military Police, Military Intelligence, Signal, Aviation
- C. Adjutant General, Finance, Ordnance, Quartermaster (Supply), Transportation, Medical
- D. Headquarters Unit (Garrison without deployment unit)
- E. Don't know

5. For how many years did you enlist in the Army?

- A. 2 years
- B. 3 years
- C. 4 years
- D. 6 years
- E. Other

6. How many of your military friends have been discharged before ETS?

- A. None
- B. One
- C. Two
- D. Three
- E. Four or more

7. Have you previously served in any other branch of the military (i.e., Air Force, Marines, Navy, etc.)?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
8. Is this your first enlistment in the Army?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
9. How many dependents do you have?(Do not count yourself as a dependent).
- A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two
 - D. Three
 - E. Four or more
10. Are you a single parent?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
11. How many of your four best friends (do not include relatives or spouse) are still in the Army?
- A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two
 - D. Three
 - E. Four
12. Where would you prefer to be assigned?
- A. Ft. Carson
 - B. Ft. Hood
13. If you are married, is your spouse with you at this post/installation/military community?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. I am not married

Please rate how important each of the following reasons were on your decision to join the Army.

- | A | B | C |
|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Not
Important |
14. For travel, excitement and new experiences.
 15. To learn a trade or skill that would be valuable in civilian life.
 16. To serve my country.
 17. To become more mature and self-reliant.
 18. The overall benefits: pay, room and board, medical care and training and Veteran's Benefits.
 19. Career opportunities in the military look better than those in civilian life.
 20. I wanted to leave some personal problems behind me.
 21. I was unemployed.
 22. I wanted to be a soldier.
 23. I was not happy in my last civilian job.
 24. I wanted to get away from home.
 25. I wanted to be more independent.
 26. I wanted to do something useful.
 27. I wanted a job which offers action and adventure.
 28. It is a family tradition.
 29. I joined because the Army takes care of its soldiers.
 30. To get a steady job.
 31. To find out what to do with my life.

In this section, tell us how much you like or dislike each on the scale below:

- | | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----|--|------------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| | Like Very Much | Like a Lot | Neutral | Dislike | Dislike Very Much |
| 32. | How much do you like doing dangerous work? | | | | |
| 33. | How much do you like getting dirty/muddy/oily? | | | | |
| 34. | How much do you like working indoors? | | | | |
| 35. | How much do you like doing paperwork? | | | | |
| 36. | How much do you like doing things not related to your job? | | | | |
| 37. | How much do you like doing "ash and trash"? | | | | |
-

The following is a list of statements. Please indicate your feeling about now much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- | | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----|--|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 38. | I have enough time off to take care of my personal and family needs. | | | | |
| 39. | I am proud to be a soldier. | | | | |
| 40. | I definitely intend to complete my first enlistment. | | | | |
| 41. | I want a reassignment to another post. | | | | |
| 42. | I don't have enough off-duty time. | | | | |
| 43. | There are good promotion opportunities in <u>my job</u> . | | | | |
| 44. | I like to go on field exercises. | | | | |
| 45. | Promotions go to the soldiers who deserve them. | | | | |
| 46. | There is too much "Mickey Mouse" in my unit. | | | | |
| 47. | Promotion opportunities are equal for <u>all</u> soldiers. | | | | |

The following is a list of statements. Please indicate your feeling about how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

48. Soldiers should have more interest in mission accomplishment and less interest in their personal concerns.
49. *Do you think* ~~I wish that more~~ soldiers really care~~d~~ about national security?[?]
50. Lower ranking soldiers need to be supervised more.
51. A person can get more of an even break as a civilian than as a soldier.
52. All in all, I am satisfied with my duty MOS.
53. In general, the Army is what I expected it to be.
54. In general, I feel that I have gotten a fair deal from the Army.
55. Considering my skills and the effort I put into the work, I am satisfied with my pay.
56. There is not enough discipline in the Army.
57. All in all, I am satisfied with my supervisor.
58. All in all, I am satisfied with the soldiers in my work group.
59. All in all, I am satisfied with the Army.
60. All in all, I am satisfied with my unit.
61. All in all, this is a good post for me to live on.
62. If I got out of the Army today, it would be hard to find a civilian job that is as good as the job I have now.
63. In my job, I have to work extra hours every week.
64. My unit is respected on this post.
65. My supervisor makes me do too many things that are not related to my job.
66. The morale in my unit is very high.
67. My morale right now is very high.
68. Male and female soldiers in my unit get assigned the same kinds of jobs.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

69. My unit can always get the job done well.
70. I could make more money outside the Army.
71. My job gives me the chance to learn skills that will help me get a job outside the Army.
72. The senior NCOs in my unit look out for the welfare of the soldiers in my unit.
73. The officers in my unit care about what happens to the soldiers in my unit.
74. All soldiers in my MOS regardless of sex are treated equally.
75. In general, an Army post is a good place to live.

=====

In this section, tell us what percent of your duty time you spent doing the following activities. For example, if you spent 100% of your duty time indoors, you would fill in the space under E on your answer sheet. If you spent 50% of your duty time indoors, you would fill in the space under C.

A	B	C	D	E
0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%

76. Outdoors
77. Doing heavy physical labor (lifting, moving heavy objects, etc.)
78. Dangerous work
79. Dirty/muddy/oily work
80. "Ash and trash"
81. Indoors
82. Doing paper work
83. Doing important work
84. Doing things not related to your job.

ON -POST FACILITIES

Below is a list of facilities found on most Army posts. On the scale below, tell us how satisfied you are with each of the facilities on THIS INSTALLATION/MILITARY COMMUNITY. Put all your answers on your answer sheet. Remember, these questions are about facilities on this post/military community.

A	B	C	D	E
Satisfied	Neutral	Dis- satisfied	Have not Used	Not Available

- 85. Arts and Crafts Center
 - 86. Photo Lab
 - 87. Auto Repair Shop (self-help)
 - 88. Enlisted Club
 - 89. Movie Theatre
 - 90. Recreation Center
 - 91. Snack Bar/Canteen
 - 92. Gymnasium
 - 93. Sports Fields
 - 94. Tennis Court
 - 95. Library
 - 96. Game Room
 - 97. Rod and Gun Club
 - 98. Army Community Services
 - 99. Churches, Synagogues, Chapel, etc.
 - 100. Hospital (Medical Care)
 - 101. Dental Care
 - 102. Post Exchange (PX)
 - 103. Commissaries
 - 104. Bowling Alley
-

OFF-POST FACILITIES

Below is a list of facilities off-post. On the scale below, tell us how satisfied you are with each of these facilities in the town around your installation/military community/post. Put all your answers on your answer sheet.

- | A | B | C | D | E |
|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Satisfied | Neutral | Dis-satisfied | Have not Used | Not Available |
- 105. Discos
 - 106. Movie Theatre
 - 107. Bowling Alley
 - 108. Athletic Facilities (Courts, Sports Fields, etc.)
 - 109. Local Bars
 - 110. Shopping - Boutiques/Department Stores
 - 111. Churches, Synagogues, etc.
 - 112. Library
 - 113. Hunting
 - 114. Fishing
 - 115. Pool Halls
 - 116. Music Concerts
 - 117. Museums
 - 118. Tourist Attractions
-

119. MOS

- A. I am working in my Primary MOS
- B. I am working in my Secondary MOS
- C. I am working in an area entirely different from my Primary or Secondary MOS

120. How well do you think BCT and AIT prepared you to do your job?

- A. Very good
- B. Somewhat good
- C. Neither good nor bad
- D. Somewhat badly
- E. Very badly

121. I am working in the job areas for which I have been trained.

- A. Yes
- B. No

122. What is your opinion of your unit's (company/troop/battery) ability to function in times of war?

- A. Not effective
- B. Slightly effective
- C. Effective
- D. Very effective
- E. Not in deployable unit.

NOW TURN OVER YOUR ANSWER SHEET

AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THERE

NOTE: In the following questions, please understand the use of "squad/crew" as meaning the smallest unit to which you are assigned, be it a squad, tank, crew, gun, etc.

51. I have good feelings about the soldiers in my squad/crew.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
52. If I was given the chance to transfer to another squad/crew, I would jump at the chance.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
53. If your squad/crew leader was replaced, what would happen to your squad/crew?
- a. It would not work well without him/her.
 - b. It would have difficulty working well without him/her.
 - c. It wouldn't make any difference.
 - d. It would work much better without him/her.
54. To what extent do you feel personally loyal and committed to your squad/crew leader.
- a. To a very great extent.
 - b. To a great extent.
 - c. To a little extent.
 - d. To a very little extent.
55. There is good cooperation and teamwork among the soldiers in my squad/crew.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
56. If your squad/crew was ordered into combat, how willingly would you enter battle with it?
- a. Very unwillingly
 - b. Unwillingly
 - c. Willingly
 - d. Very willingly

51. I have good feelings about the soldiers in my platoon/section.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
52. If I was given the chance to change to another platoon/section, I would jump at the chance.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
53. If your platoon/section leader was replaced, what would happen to your platoon/section?
- a. It would not work well without him/her.
 - b. It would have difficulty working well without him/her.
 - c. It wouldn't make any difference.
 - d. It would work much better without him/her.
54. To what extent do you feel personally loyal and committed to your platoon/section leader?
- a. To a very great extent.
 - b. To a great extent.
 - c. To a little extent.
 - d. To a very little extent.
55. There is good cooperation and teamwork among the soldiers in my platoon/section.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
56. If your platoon/section was ordered into combat, how willingly would you enter battle with it?
- a. Very unwillingly
 - b. Unwillingly
 - c. Willingly
 - d. Very willingly

51. I have good feelings about the soldiers in my company/battery.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
52. If I was given the chance to change to another company/battery, I would jump at the chance.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
53. If your company/battery commander was replaced, what would happen to your company/battery?
- It would not work well without him/her.
 - It would have difficulty working well without him/her.
 - It wouldn't make any difference.
 - It would work much better without him/her.
54. To what extent do you feel personally loyal and committed to your company/battery commander?
- To a very great extent
 - To a great extent
 - To a little extent
 - To a very little extent
55. There is good cooperation and teamwork among the soldiers in my company/battery.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
56. If your company/battery was ordered into combat, how willingly would you enter battle with it?
- Very unwillingly
 - Unwillingly
 - Willingly
 - Very willingly

51. I have good feelings about the soldiers in my battalion.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
52. If I was given the chance to change to another battalion, I would jump at the chance.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
53. If your battalion commander was replaced, what would happen to your battalion?
- a. It would not work well without him/her.
 - b. It would have difficulty working well without him/her.
 - c. It wouldn't make any difference.
 - d. It would work much better without him/her.
54. To what extent do you feel personally loyal and committed to your battalion commander?
- a. To a very great extent
 - b. To a great extent
 - c. To a little extent
 - d. To a very little extent
55. There is good cooperation and teamwork among the soldiers in my battalion.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Disagree
 - d. Strongly disagree
56. If your battalion was ordered into combat, how willingly would you enter battle with it?
- a. Very unwillingly
 - b. Unwillingly
 - c. Willingly
 - d. Very willingly